

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated March 11, 2005

### REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17, and 18 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 6, and 15 are independent. Claims 6 and 15 have been amended to incorporate limitations from their dependent claims. Claims 7, 9, and 16 have been cancelled. Claim 8 has been amended so as not to depend from a cancelled claim.

In the Office Action, all the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by WO 01/52106 A2 (*Gal*). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 and submits that the remaining claims, as amended, are patentable.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of selectively distributing invitations for a plurality of events, and the last step recited in that claim reads as follows:

sending an e-mail invitation to at least some of the members for whom a match was detected in the detecting step, wherein the e-mail invitation invites its recipient to at least some of the events for which a match was detected in the detecting step, and wherein at least one of the e-mail invitations sent in the sending step invites its recipient to a plurality of events for which a match was detected in the detecting steps.

To satisfy the underlined portions of this claim, at least one of the invitations must (a) invite its recipient to a plurality of events (in other words, it must be a multi-event invitation) and (b) be sent via email.

The applicant recognizes that *Gal* describes a multi-event invitation at p. 5, lines 15-20 and in FIG. 4. However, that portion of *Gal* does not teach or suggest sending the multi-event invitation via email. To the contrary, *Gal* specifies that the invitation “is dynamically constructed” “when a user goes to the web page for the user’s invitations.” *Gal* at p. 5, lines 18-20. *Gal* then goes on to explain that the invitations should not be generated via email as follows: “The advantage of [generating] the message with the dynamically created web page rather than a traditional E-mail type message is that the messages are not considered as intrusive [and] don’t clog up the recipient’s work or home E-mail system.” *Gal* at p. 6, lines 1-6. Since *Gal* explains

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated March 11, 2005

that email should not be used to serve the multi-event invitations, and claim 1 explicitly recites that the invitations are set via email, *Gal* teaches away from the method of claim 1.

Applicant recognizes that *Gal* does mention sending a message via email at page 3, line 15. However, *Gal*'s mention of this email message is made in connection with a different embodiment, and *Gal* contains no teaching or suggestion that this email message is a multi-event invitation. Because claim 1 requires "at least one of the e-mail invitations sent in the sending step invites its recipient to a plurality of events," claim 1 is not satisfied by sending any message via email. It is only satisfied when a multi-event invitation is sent via email, which is not disclosed in *Gal*. Claim 1 is therefore believed patentable over *Gal*.

Independent claims 6 and 15, as amended, each include limitations that require at least one of the invitations to (a) invite its recipient to a plurality of events and (b) be sent via email. Those claims are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons as claim 1, as explained above.

The other claims in this application each depend on one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated March 11, 2005

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at (212) 969-3246 or by facsimile at (212) 969-2900. Please direct all correspondence to Customer No. 21890 at the address provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

Dated: June 8, 2005

By: 

Robert S. Mayer  
Reg. No. 38,544

Proskauer Rose LLP  
Patent Department  
1585 Broadway  
New York, NY 10036-8299  
Tel. (212) 969-3246 (direct)  
Fax (212) 969-2900